DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 892 SO 015 696

AUTHOR Hallett, Judith P.
TITLE Classics and Women's Studies. Working Paper No. 119.
INSTITUTION Wellesley Coll., Mass. Center for Research on Women.
SPONS AGENCY Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 33p.; For related documents on women and university courses, see SO 015 695-699.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181 ($3.50).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Ancient History; *Classical Languages; *Classical Literature; Course Content; *Females; Feminism; Greek Civilization; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Latin; Linguistics; Males; *Scholarship; *Sex Role; Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

A consideration of classical study as an evolving profession includes discussion of classical content and methodology and an examination of the role of women both as objects of classical inquiry and as classical scholars. Material is arranged in three parts. In part A, classical content and scope are defined. The interdisciplinary and elitist nature of classical study and the meaning of philology are considered from ancient and modern perspectives. Part B examines basic assumptions and methods underlying the field of classics. The emphasis on a male elite in classical culture and literature and the resulting impact of Greco-Roman culture on Western tradition are analyzed. Also discussed are the traditional male dominance in classical scholarship and teaching and recent developments which have created a situation favorable to the study of women in antiquity. Part C outlines some of the problems involved in integrating women into the study of the classics. Problems in standard Greek and Latin translations, the lack of classical literature written by women and textbooks available for an introductory course on women in classical times are among the topics reviewed. (LP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED244892

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith P. Hallett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The three of us sat around a brass coffee table. Polina told me about Hrosvitha, a tenth-century German nun who wrote plays in crystal clear Latin. She played with Alice's hair and continued her tale of the nun. Her Latin was as good as Terence's, the Roman playwright. And that was so pure that no one would believe a woman could write such perfect verse. It was a raging controversy in the medieval scholars' world, equal to the controversy over black intelligence in the psychology world....

My triumph of the evening was in picking up a copy of Hrosvitha's "Dulcitius" and reading it right off the page, in cadence.

"That's lovely. Your Latin is lovely."

"Thank you. I studied it all through high school and I'm still at it in college. I'm reading Livy and Tacitus these days with a little Attic Greek thrown in for good measure."

Polina clapped her hands and gave me a bear hug. "No wonder you've been so helpful to me! You're a classics scholar. We're a rare breed these days, you know. Ever since they took Latin off the compulsory study list in high schools, we've been slipping. But I find that only the brightest kids keep on with Latin. That's good, I guess."

"Well, I'm not really a classics scholar. I'm in film studies. I take Latin and Greek for the language credit, but I love them."

"I hope so. Greek is too difficult to take for laughs. If you're in film studies, why Latin and Greek?"

"Uh--this may sound funny to you, but Latin especially has helped my ability to discipline myself more than anything I've ever studied. It wouldn't matter what I would do, Latin would help me because it taught me how to think. And Greek, that adds a soaring quality, something that pushed my mind fast. I--well, this must sound stupid to you."

"No, no, not at all. I think that's exactly right about Latin teaching you the process of logic, to think, I mean. Too bad a few more of our politicians haven't studied it."

Alice was sitting wide-eyed through all this. "Molly, is that true about the Latin or are you buttering the old lady up?" She ribbed her mother and Polina grabbed her hand and held it.

"No. I know it sounds weird but it was the best thing I ever studied. I take that back. Not the best thing, but the most useful."

Alice moved forward on her seat. "Mom has been at me to take Latin so I did this year. I hate it. But maybe that's because my teacher is a fossil."

"Latin teachers have a way of getting ossified."

"Mine is pickled! Have you made any movies yet?"

Rita Mae Brown, Rubyfruit Jungle
(New York, 1973), 191-192

Sober discussions on higher education in the liberal arts and humanities, and on classics as a discipline and profession, often feature the very same topics here humorously treated by Rita Mae Brown: the survival of classical languages and classical learning in Western culture; the nature and value of studying classics today; the shortcomings of pedagogy and scholarship in classics. Be they general or specialist, such discussions in turn often feature the very same arguments which Brown has assigned to her three fictive symposiasts here: Professor Polina Bellantoni, her daughter Alice, and the

picaresque narrator-heroine Molly Bolt. Yet the differences between customary discussions and Rita Mae Brown's funny fictive symposium on these topics far outnumber the similarities. For one thing, Molly Bolt is not merely "buttering up" Alice's "old lady" but successfully angling to seduce both Polina and Alice. While out of context these lines may have the ring of disinterested propaganda for the classics cause, their strategic sexual purpose within the novel places them in a symposiastic literary tradition stretching back to Plato, and to the unsuccessful campaign of Alcibiades to bed down with Socrates.[1]

There are, however, striking differences between Brown's fictive symposium and most sober, scholarly discussions on the same topics. These differences stem from Brown's refusal to share a widely-held, if not always articulated, view of classics as an elite male preserve. Brown's symposium does not, for example, restrict itself to the celebrated male authors who have bequeathed 99.44% of what constitutes classical Greek and Latin literature. Indeed, it begins by reflecting on a female who composed classical-style Latin works, albeit a female of the medieval period in Germany. So, too, Brown and her symposiasts all are women; more importantly, they all judge classics a female concern, an intellectual pursuit in which women figure prominently not only as objects of study, but also as teachers and students. Brown does not judge classics solely an elite female concern either; she depicts Molly as having been raised in anything-but-genteel poverty, and as working her way through college. Furthermore, as it progresses, Brown's symposium touches upon both positive and negative experiences which women

have had in all three "classical" roles.

The treatment of these same and other topics which follow is not a funny, seductive, symposiastic disquisition justifying classics study. It is yet another sober discussion, focused on the classics as an evolving profession and discipline as well as on matters of classical scholarship and pedagogy. Nevertheless, it does share with Brown's seductive symposium a focus on classics as a female concern. It will first attempt, however, to define the field of classics in terms of both content and scope; it will then consider the assumptions classicists hold and the methods they use. Both of these preliminary sections will also look at changes made possible by various developments in the field of classics at the same time that they point out certain continuities in the classics profession. Having sketched in this basic background, I will then turn to a consideration of how women have been and might better be fitted into the study of classical antiquity as objects of inquiry; at the same time I will be considering how the largely female population of scholars, instructors, and students dealing with women in classical antiquity have been able to undertake this inquiry.[2] Throughout my discussion, I will be stressing the various problems encountered by those of us committed to integrating the study of women into the study of Greco-Roman antiquity. Yet to counter my emphasis on these problematic areas, I will be calling attention to the satisfying, and at time exhilarating, results of efforts during the past decade and a half to bring the study of women into both the discipline and profession.

A. The Field of Classics: Its Content and Scope

Defining what classics "contains" is a complicated task. The very process of definition, though, will help to illuminate why the study of women has become integrated into both the discipline and the profession to the degree that it has. The professional organization of college and university classicists here in North America is called the American Philological Association (APA). The word "philology" also appears in the names of various North American publications and academic degrees having to do with classics. The association of this word with the study of Greek and Latin language and literature originated, and continues to this day, in Europe. Here in North America the adjective "philological" serves to distinguish the APA, an organization of classical language and literature devotees, from that of its sister learned society on this continent: The Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), with whom the APA meets jointly each December. The AIA concerns itself with material remains from antiquity, primarily those from the ancient Greco-Roman world. Yet Greco-Roman antiquity is not their sole concern; the 1980 AIA meeting included a session on ancient China; the Near East and North Africa always occupy a prominent place on the AIA program too.

Technically speaking, the term "philology", from the Greek for "love of learning" is defined today as a synonym for historical linguistics. It thus may not qualify as a suitable label for what most contemporary classicists do.[3] Nevertheless, when the APA and many classics journals and degree programs were established, and as late as the early 20th century, "philology" applied to the general study of language and literature. It could, moreover, be used without further qualification to signify the study of ancient Greek and Latin

languages and literatures both here and abroad because these languages and literatures were regarded as the main, if not the only, ones worth studying. Furthermore, to the men who formed classics as a discipline during a period extending from the sixteenth century down to the early 20th century, classical philology also embraced the study of ancient history and ancient philosophy. Indeed, it was formally defined as dealing with "human speech, and with all that speech discloses as to the nature and history of man." Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848-1931), Professor at Berlin and the King Solomon of our profession, went even further.[5] His Geschichte der Philologie (1921) deals with scholarship on ancient Greek and Roman artifacts and monuments as well as on the languages, literary texts, history, and philosophy of the ancient Greeks and Romans.[6] For Wilamowitz believed that "a student of philology must be a student of Altertumswissenschaft, the science of antiquity" as a whole.[7] Additionally, although this term, "the science of antiquity," owes its invention to nineteenth century German scholars, the concept of philology as the unified scientific study of everything connected with Greco-Roman antiquity may be traced back to French scholars three hundred years before Wilamowitz.[8]

This wide, and what we today would call interdisciplinary, definition of classical philology was formulated by the most influential scholars in Europe in part because of the wide variety of self-enhancing cultural uses to which classical antiquity was put by the European elite from the Renaissance onwards. Obviously, the languages and surviving texts of classical antiquity were at this time mined and mimed to create words for and literary expressions of complex ideas. But its forms of government, social institutions, modes of

reasoning and analysis, and scientific and medical lore were appropriated as well. So, too, its works of art and architecture were copied in, and literally expropriated to, the chief European capitals.[9] England, and particularly its most venerable abode of learning, Oxford, also adopted this broader definition of what studying Greco-Roman antiquity entailed. For this reason, the study of its languages, literature, history, and philosophy was prized there as ideal life-preparation for gentle and/or ambitious men with the prospect of widely ranging worldly activities and/or entry into the prestigious civil service. To this day, an undergraduate classics concentration at Oxford is called "Greats", and a concentrator--the American connotations of the word notwithstanding--a "classic."[10]

This wide, interdisciplinary definition of classical philology has not guaranteed a sound and comprehensive understanding of classical antiquity to all classical philologists. Nor has it ensured that classical antiquity is invariably perceived as "relevant" to the issues of a given day. A wide, interdisciplinary definition of classical philology has not even kept its actual study from being limited and narrow. In what is referred to as the early Wilamowitzian era, Friedrich Nietzsche, a classical philologist more widely remembered than Wilamowitz in our own times, attacked his fellow professionals in his notes to "We Philologists" for their ethnocentric approach to antiquity, self-superiority, and blindness to the true--violent and horrifying--nature of classical civilization.[11] Later in the Wilamowitzian period, when Werner Jaeger assumed the chair of classical philology at Basel which Nietzsche had once held, he vocally sought to resuscitate the classics as a

formative influence in contemporary culture. To Jaeger, his subject had been rendered remote by "an exaggerated historicism", product no doubt of the "scientific" approach to antiquity.[12] Among the nineteenth century British elite, a notion that Latin and Greek were too difficult for girls to master was balanced by the assumption that art and music--deemed "womanish things"--were "too lightweight" for boys. As John Ruskin noted indignantly, Greek visual art was for this reason in his time excluded from the Oxford curriculum. As a recent study remarks, exclusions of this sort encouraged education in the classics to become "an instrument of philistinism" and "the Victorian ideal of the well-rounded man" to be "badly dented on one side."[13] All the same, however far classicists may have fallen from their long-lived desideratum of a truly holistic outlook on Greco-Roman antiquity, it is significant that they even aspire to attain such an outlook. Though such discipline-wide aspirations may intimidate or even repel scholars who wish to specialize, they provide a strong foundation for the interdisciplinary background and perspective needed to investigate women in antiquity properly.

Defining the scope of classical antiquity, the Altertum of Altertumswissenschaft, is relatively uncomplicated. The mere process, however, again points up the numerous elitist associations of the field. Chronologically, the antiquity studied by classical philologists spans the years from around 1400 B.C. (when decipherable Greek, Linear B, starts being written in the Bronze Age, and when the great Greek mythic heroes supposedly flourished) to around A.D. 450 (when Rome fell to so-called barbarian hordes). Geographically, it covers those parts of Europe, Africa, and Asia which the Greeks and Romans conquered

and settled, and where Greek and/or Latin were either spoken or employed as the official bureaucratic language. In The Realms of Gold, Margaret Drabble represents her classical archaeologist heroine as initially thwarted by her own professor in her highly successful efforts to unearth an ancient urban trade center in the Sahara; according to his "fixed views of classical antiquity", "nothing south of Leptis Magna [in Libya] could be taken seriously."[14] For all intents and purposes, such sentiments still hold true throughout the classics profession. Places which the ancient Greeks and Romans may have visited but did not conquer do not rate as classical lands; ancient works not written in Greek and Latin, and Greek and Latin works written after the fourth century A.D. are not reckoned classics. In this connection, it bears noting that the very words "classical" and "classic" convey an elitizing value judgment, meaning as they do "that which is of highest rank", "commanding respect as an outstanding representative of its class" (much as "philology" did by literally meaning "the loving study of literary and linguistic learning" but referring to Greek and Latin languages and literatures alone).[15] For this reason, many classicists, such as myself, feel uncomfortable about using these words only for that which the ancient Greeks and Romans created and controlled. We prefer such terms as "Greek", "Roman", "Latin", and "Greco-Roman." Whatever labels one chooses, this requirement of ancient Greek and/or Roman creation and control--and the implicit assumption that such a genesis and ownership accord special worth denied to items of later date, or in other languages, or of different cultural origin--is in and of itself elitist and selective; changing the name does not alter the underlying prejudice.

Nevertheless, it bears noting that even though most of ancient Asia and

Africa lie outside the purview of classics as it is technically defined, peoples of color who lived under Greco-Roman rule fall well inside it. Frank Snowden's books vividly document the total absence of color prejudice among the classical Greeks and Romans.[16] By the same token, a concern with social class and class economic exploitation as phenomena in the ancient Greco-Roman world has since Marx and Engels been evinced by many eminent classical scholars. So has an interest in male and female members of the Greco-Roman working classes, and in male and female slaves.[17] Elitist though classics may be, this elitism does not presently have a racist cast or involve neglect of the lower social orders.[18] And although the chronological, geographical, and linguistic boundaries of classical antiquity are strictly drawn, for several generations the survival of both the classical tradition and the Greek and Latin languages through later ages has bulked large as a scholarly concern of the classics (and other segments of the academic) community. This concern includes a growing interest in the history of classical learning and scholarship.[19] Consequently, research into the relationship between the study of the classical world in a given place and time and the significant issues of that place and time ranks as a priority to many members of our profession. Needless to say, this commitment to ascertaining and understanding how attitudes and practices of later eras relate to those of classical antiquity, or at least how a later era's perceptions of classical attitudes and practices affected its own, has considerable importance for the study of women, both in classical antiquity and in later societies on which classical antiquity exerted an impact. Admittedly, various scholars seeking to elucidate the position of women in Greco-Roman antiquity have suffered from the ethnocentricity and self-superiority decried by Nietzsche, and projected or superimposed

assumptions of their own milieu onto the ancient Greeks and Romans.[20] These potential deficits of this cross-cultural perspective are, however, outweighed by the benefits.

B. The Field of Classics: Its Basic Assumptions and Methods

Greco-Roman antiquity was once valued not only as the fount and inspiration of contemporary Western culture, but also as a civilization for male ruling elites to continue emulating.[21] Thus, its study was compulsory for those aspiring to become properly educated, and awarded such elitizing labels as "classics" and "philology." Nevertheless, the idealization of classical antiquity and the consequent assumption that it provided a model for modern times had negative results: e.g. sanctioning the adoption of such ancient Greek and Roman practices as slavery; the misconception of Greco-Roman antiquity which Nietzsche severely criticized. What is more, after the discovery that German (and English) could claim membership along with Greek and Latin in the Indo-European family of languages, a sense of racial kinship with the classical (and particularly the Greek) elite emerged in certain quarters. Blending with the notion of antiquity as cultural parent and model, this concept served to justify classical learning as somehow illuminating "Aryan" culture and its "natural" superiority.[22]

Worship of and self-identification with antiquity have, therefore, yielded embarrassing results. Awareness and appreciation of non-Indo-European and non-Western cultures have also increased over the course of this century. Thus classicists today do not by and large esteem the Greeks and Romans as a culturally superior, blood kindred civilization for elites to imitate. Rather, they value Greco-Roman antiquity merely as important to and influential on our later, Western civilization and mainly as interesting in and of itself. Indeed, this value should probably be regarded as the one basic assumption that all present-day

classicists share. The value placed on classics and the classical tradition as a major part of our Western heritage has, moreover, traditionally manifested itself in a linguistic form. For centuries Greco-Roman antiquity has been approached and absorbed through long-term study of its languages, especially and initially Latin. The assumptions and practices of this particular linguistic tradition now warrant detailed discussion: in part because this tradition has not been especially hospitable to the study of women in antiquity, in part because recent developments have caused it to undergo some changes which have in turn promoted such study.

It has been customary in Europe, England, and American private schools to start students in Latin and Greek at what has been called "the age when the memory is best " (i.e. at something like ages 8-12 for Latin, 11-15 for Greek).[23] At the same time, a Social Darwinian philosophy of who got taught the classical tongues, and how, has been in effect both here and abroad. As it happens, the study of Latin is, in Molly Bolt's words, "useful." Most obviously, it is invaluable to the comprehension and acquisition of complex English, since so much of what is complex about English derives from or resembles Latin. Students slow to master English as a native or national language stand to profit by exposure to Latin no less than do the verbally gifted. The study of Latin also aids in learning Romance and Germanic languages. Nevertheless, only academically elite students aiming to enter prestigious colleges and professions have been encouraged to take Latin; mainly those able to withstand rigorous trials of their memory and patience have been able to stick with it. And while this elite group of students has by no means excluded women, it has certainly favored--at least at entry level--males of affluence and/or ambition. Furthermore, the privileged place once accorded the classical languages in the curriculum preparing students

for higher education, and the former use of the classical languages as a "tool" to distinguish students suitable for this pursuit from those ill-suited, allowed generations of instructors to become "fossilized, ossified, and pickled." Antediluvian, uninspired, and even sadistic teaching techniques were common: like Molly Bolt, proud survivors of several years' Latin and Greek study in days of yore might praise the experience for its discipline, but the wounded could in all fairness regard what they had lived through as bondage. Such a philosophy of instructing the classical languages is, in my estimation, analogous to one which would allow only potential Olympic swimming champions to get into water over their heads, and then force them to tread water in handcuffs holding barbells.[24]

This elitist, exclusive, invariably competitive, and male-oriented pedagogical situation did, however, accord well with the nature of the material studied at advanced levels of Latin and Greek training. Here in the U.S., for example, the vocabulary items, forms and grammatical rules, speedily memorized, by rote, in huge amounts, during elementary study were supposed to facilitate successful memorizers to translate, into stilted and elaborate English, passages from a fixed succesession of standard authors. These authors were selected, in nineteenth century England and New England, because of the already much-observed connection between classics and the male ruling elite, and so that elite men might be better prepared for various, competitive, and exclusive professions. The Anglo-American Latin sequence featured Julius Caesar's Gallic Wars (for future military officers), then Cicero (for lawyers and statesmen-to-be), and Vergil (the spiritual Aeneid and fourth Eclogue for clergymen, the Georgics for farmers). One might then advance to Horace and Catullus (presumably for their

appreciation of rural and urban life), to the comedies of Plautus and Terence, to the moralizing satire of Juvenal and the moralizing pro-republican histories of Livy and Tacitus. The Greek sequence initially featured Xenophon's militaristic Anabasis as counterpart to Caesar, followed by Homer's militaristic and spiritual Iliad, Plato on the saintly last days of Socrates, and perhaps a morally uplifting tragedy such as Sophocles' Oedipus Rex. As a complement to reading these classical authors, and in recognition of the paradigmatic role occupied by classical antiquity, prose and verse compositions adhering to their literary forms and imitating their literary styles might also be assigned.[25]

Needless to say, the translation, stylistic analysis, and comprehension of these and related works took U.S. students through secondary school into college and graduate school (British students, who started and specialized much earlier, got through such and other authors with time to spare as undergraduates. They then embarked upon teaching in secondary schools and universities directly after the B.A. or a few years' additional, hyperspecialized research; at Oxford and Cambridge, in fact, the Ph.D. was looked down upon by serious classical scholars until a few years ago.) Traditionally, however, advanced study in classics worldwide was also linked with closely reading and painstakingly explicating and interpreting the major texts and inscriptions of what have been thought the major periods of classical antiquity: archaic Greece, fifth and fourth century B.C. ("Classical") Athens, and Rome from the second century B.C. through the second century A.D. Owing to the interdisciplinary outlook on classical antiquity so firmly entrenched in the profession, this undertaking entailed a combination of linguistic, literary, historical, and philosophical, and in certain circumstances artistic and archaeological, analysis. Yet this

undertaking did not entail the mastery or application of any prescribed or privileged methods. As a matter of fact, the patriarchs of the profession violently attacked the mere idea of "philological method." Wilamowitz is even celebrated for offering an aquatic metaphor to explain how classical scholars should tackle their work, a metaphor quite unlike my own likening of Latin learning to staying afloat in its predatory emphasis: "There simply isn't any /philological method/--any more than a method to catch fish. The whale is harpooned; the herring caught in a net; minnows are trapped; the salmon speared; trout are caught on a fly. Where do you find the method to catch fish?"[26]

The view of classical philology as a scientific enterprise also awarded special scholarly prestige to the "scientific" practice of textual criticism in that many scholars substituted textual criticism for the "unscientific" appreciation and interpretation of literary form, tone of language and meaning. Textual critics' efforts to establish the correct text of a given work could involve a-contextual and ethnocentric selections and inventions of "superior" manuscript readings, and defense of one's own selections and inventions by impugning the intellect and reason of those who might disagree. Needless to say, scholarship of this type played a role in provoking Nietzsche, and has done nothing to combat the image of classicists as arbitrary, authoritarian, arrogant, and narrowminded pedants. The concern for developing aesthetic sensibilities in the education of women may also account for the fact that few women classicists have distinguished themselves in textual critical scholarship.[27] The "scientific" approach and disdain for literary interpretation can also claim responsibility for the acquisitive nature of much scholarly research on classical antiquity.

Doctoral dissertations were for generations expected to make an "original" contribution to classical scholarship, and hence tended merely to collect information from ancient literary and inscriptional texts.[28] To be sure, such researches have gathered a considerable quantity of data about Greco-Roman women among other things, but to no clear purpose at the time the gathering took place.[29]

It bears remarking, though, that the canon of major Greek and Latin authors has always been a fairly flexible and expanding one.[30] Since almost nothing new from classical antiquity ever shows up any more, boredom can easily set in with what has been previously canonized. External scholarly and cultural factors can also cause a neglected author or work to attract the interest and attention of scholars and students and other learned readers. Problems in the manuscripts of the Roman love elegist Propertius, for example, lured the revered textual critic A.E. Housman to edit him and in consequence inspired the classics community and intellectual public (such as Ezra Pound) to read more of his work.[31] New manuscript or papyrus items or scraps send classicists scurrying to both the work and author in question, and to any later works and authors the discovery may have influenced.[32] The selection of antique literary models to inspire and validate new literary efforts by sundry modern Western authors has since medieval times done much to upgrade the status of different ancients such as Ovid, Seneca, and Petronius in different periods.[33] Ancient works can also rise and decline in modern evaluations as a result of political and ideological developments. In consequence, classical authors and works concerned with women (albeit almost always from a male perspective) can for various reasons receive more notice and respect. By the same token, a greater, culture-wide interest in women would, and actually does, confer more importance upon classical literature by and about females.[34]

Recent developments in classics teaching and scholarship in this country are, moreover, creating a situation in which the study of women in antiquity is becoming increasingly more respected and important. Here in the United States, general, liberal arts education (rather than total specialization in one, closely career-related, subject) has been established as the standard pre-professional undergraduate background in most areas; such education, which possesses a certain cachet even for those undecided about their futures, contains a humanities component and quite often a foreign language requirement. The fact that fewer and fewer college students have had or have time to concentrate in the Latin and Greek languages themselves, combined with the need to integrate Greco-Roman antiquity and its tongues into general humanities and foreign language requirement programs, has brought about two significant changes that have broken decisively with the tradition of classics pedagogy. The first is the creation of the three- or four- semester program in Latin and/or Greek designed to fulfill a foreign language requirement. Courses in this sequence are tailored for both the highly motivated student as well as students with less interest in language learning. They emphasize Roman and/or Greek culture as well as the mastery of Latin and Greek linguistic fundamentals; as the culmination of their work, students read in the original languages ancient literary texts selected to represent the range of Greek and Latin writings, many of which did not figure in earlier classics curricula. The second and more visible innovation is the classics course in translation. Such courses treat such topics as Greco-Roman mythology, philosophy, civilization, religion, and women. In accordance with pre-Wilamowitzian practice, these courses adopt an interdisciplinary approach; at the same time, they reflect Wilamowitzian taste in their focus on the material remains of antiquity. No less importantly, they often embrace new methodologies popularized by other

disciplines: New Criticism; semiotics; psychoanalytic, Marxist, structuralist, and feminist theory.

The need to acquire methods for in-translation teaching has given many of the U.S. scholars who are so engaged a new outlook on their teaching and research about works in the original languages, and has had considerable impact on U.S. scholarship (the influence of French classical scholars has, it should be added, helped form this new outlook and contributed to this impact too). The experience of teaching and reaching students other than the most privileged, devoted, docile, and gifted in both in-translation and language-requirement-sequence courses has also forced many classicists so engaged to strengthen, restructure, clarify, enliven, and generally humanize their presentations (though sadistic torture still boasts its classicist practitioners). Most crucially, these so-called "service" teaching endeavors directed at the higher education masses have allowed the classics profession to survive and continue the discipline. Scholars in the field abroad are now trying as best they can to emulate U.S. classicists and launching such courses themselves (and when they cannot, trying to emigrate to these shores).

C. Integrating Women into the Study of Classical Antiquity: Some Problems

Among the most striking changes in the field of classics during the past decade has been the positive response to the women's movement.[35] Many women and men in the profession are currently involved in research and pedagogy on women, and have contributed towards the integration of feminist perspectives into the study of Greco-Roman antiquity. Two professional organizations of North American classicists have assumed the forefront in assessing and advancing women's status in the profession, one of which explicitly endorses feminist research and teaching. Still, both teaching and

conducting research on women in classical antiquity have their difficulties, some remedial, others insuperable.

Informing undergraduates about the images and real lives of women in Greco-Roman times is best achieved in a one- or two-semester in-translation course integrated into a larger women's studies curriculum, and devoted totally to the topic. A textbook--S.B. Pomeroy, Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: in Classical Antiquity (New York, 1975)--and a volume of sources in translation--M.R. Lefkowitz and M.B. Fant, Women's Life in Greece and Rome (Baltimore, 1982)--are available for that precise purpose, as are various collections of articles; these materials can easily be supplemented by readings from other relevant ancient works sold in inexpensive translations.[36] Such courses exist in abundance throughout the United States and Canada. They should not, however, be the only courses in which ancient Greek and Roman women receive close attention; these same (and other available) materials can be employed for "mainstream" in-translation courses on ancient history, philosophy, civilization, myth, and religion. The mention of such courses, however, gets back to the matter of how classics should be integrated into the women's studies curriculum, a huge subject beyond the scope of the present paper. Nevertheless, many of the basic texts used for such courses on classics-in-translation apportion inadequate treatment to women. Donald Dudley's widely sold The Civilization of Rome (New York, 1960), for example, does not even admit an entry for "women" in its index; H.D.F. Kitto's section on women in his acclaimed The Greeks teems with ethnocentric, self-superior, and wrong-headed assertions that would have angered even the oft-misogynistic Nietzsche.[37] It is no less annoying that many teachers of such courses refuse to abandon or supplement

these texts. And while some classics teachers still fail to integrate women into their in-translation courses because they opine women to be "insignificant" to "what really matters" about the aspect of antiquity in question, this is not always their motivation. Resistance to altering tried and true syllabi and routines, and insecurity about presenting material not formally studied in graduate school, can be at work, too. The National Endowment for the Humanities sponsored a summer institute for college teachers on women in classical antiquity for the first time in 1983; this venture has long been overdue, and merits frequent repetition. A unit on women in antiquity has also been incorporated into a 1983 NEH summer institute for two- and four-year college teachers on classical civilization courses in translation. Still, for the entire population of classics faculty to be knowledgeable about, and hence properly acquaint their own "in-translation" students with, women in antiquity, more and more accurate notice will have to be accorded the topic in graduate school curricula and best-selling undergraduate textbooks on ancient history, civilization, and myth. This task will, I fear, take at least the next decade to accomplish.

Yet another problem posed by teaching courses in translation on women in classical antiquity involves the translations themselves. Many popular English renderings of ancient Greek and Latin works give a misleading impression of what the text actually says about women. Even the much-esteemed and purchased Richmond Lattimore translations of the Iliad and Odyssey lead readers astray. Although Lattimore correctly translates a Greek verb meaning "ruled" on the several occasions where a male is its subject, he renders it "was queen" on the one occasion when it refers to a woman. Odysseus's praise of marriage as

an equal partnership of "man and woman" becomes, in Lattimore's version, "a man and his wife."[38] The Penguin translation of Herodotus' Histories represents Herodotus as stating that it seemed to him "a most strange and interesting thing" that "Artemisia, a woman, should have taken part in" the Persian War. Herodotus actually asseverates that he considers it "a marvel" that she "played the part of a commander."[39] For this reason, even those undergraduates extensively informed and very enthusiastic about current and further research on women in classical antiquity as a result of taking in-translation courses specifically on the subject cannot themselves undertake such research seriously without learning Latin and Greek. Better translations would, of course, be welcome in all events, but these will be a long time coming, and no substitute for reading texts in the original.

Integrating Greek and Roman women into elementary Greek and Latin language courses poses even more problems. The main difficulty stems from the fact that very little ancient Greek and Latin survives which was written by women themselves. What does survive, such as bits of Sappho or the Roman love elegist Sulpicia, is only accessible to students with advanced linguistic skills, and often only survives courtesy of later males at best bemused by, and at worst determined to discredit, such anomalous females. Thus it is virtually impossible to ascertain, much less incorporate into lower level language courses, how Greek and Roman women used and affected their own languages, and how they viewed the cultures around them. Moreover, most of the ancient Greek, and especially the Latin, which does survive was not only written by men, for and about a male elite, but written in a variety of artificial styles (and in the

case of the Greek works, regional dialects). To my mind lower level Greek and Latin courses should have as their main aim preparing and stimulating students to read some of the most outstanding literary works in these languages as well and as soon as they can. I see no advantage in spending much time on the "Hallmark card" Greek and Latin of women's grave inscriptions, since such exercises will not be of much help for taking on Homeric or Aeschylean or Tacitean style, and since such inscriptions were composed by men anyhow. As it happens, female characters and figures appear prominently in many of what are judged the most outstanding works of classical literature, among them Homer's epics, Aeschylus' tragedies, and Tacitus' Annals. Nevertheless, the traditional male elite bias of Latin and Greek teaching has sprung from, and continues to be marked by, so complete an identification with the Greco-Roman male elite that beginning language and literature textbooks often do not bother to acknowledge this female presence, either in their made-up sentences about Greco-Roman life or in their adapted and actual selections from the great Greek and Latin works.

A case in point is Wheelock's introductory Latin text. This Latin book, particularly popular on college campuses today, fails to feature women or even many feminine nouns in exercises or review sections. Admittedly, Wheelock's passages from Latin authors do contain some Catullan verses about the poet's emotionally wringing relationship with his mistress Lesbia, three bits of letters from the younger Pliny about a happy marriage, a husband-wife suicide, and the heroic death of an adolescent girl, and a few Ciceronian quips and epigrams by Martial in which females figure. These Latin passages are, however, located at the back of the book as "extra-credit" projects for rapidly

progressing students. Similarly, the selections featuring women constitute but a small percentage of all the passages assembled there.[40]

Certain of the Ciceronian quips and Martial epigrams, moreover, can only be judged jokes at women's expense, since they deal with a man admired for wishing his wife dead and a woman criticized for foolishly pursuing a man who wisely avoids her. As it happens, misogynistic statements and stereotyping remarks about women are numerous in both Greek and Latin authors. To include a few, as Wheelock has done, is only to represent women's image in classical antiquity truthfully; Wheelock also balances such unflattering Latin portrayals of women with more attractive ones. To include essentially nothing else about women save such unpleasant utterances as "woman, silence brings adornment to women" is something else entirely. Yet this is what one encounters in the prestigious Harvard University Press Introduction to Greek, authored by A. Chase and H. Phillips, two retired classics masters from Andover and Exeter.[41] Like Wheelock, Chase and Phillips suffer from ethnocentricism and neglect to point out the distinctive sexual asymmetries, and the larger limitations placed on female activities, in classical times. Their failure to furnish the cultural background of such utterances makes the unbalanced representation of Greek women all the more reprehensible. No less offensive are Chase and Phillips' quotations of these utterances out of their immediate literary context, their equally unflattering portrayals of women in the made-up English and Greek practice sentences, and their use of both ancient utterances and modern practice sentences about women to provide comic relief. Admittedly, other elementary Greek texts do not treat Greek women so disgracefully, and the Chase and Phillips book does not corner the market to the extent it

did 20 years ago, when prestigious schools like Wellesley and Bryn Mawr considered it "solid." Yet, much needs to be changed in other books as well as theirs if elementary Greek students are to be exposed to what Greek women's lives were like and what Greek literature has to say about them.

Once students reach the stage where they can read ancient authors, inscriptions and papyri, studying Greek and Roman women in their cultural context becomes more feasible. Papyri, in fact, include census records for, legal documents about, and personal correspondence by non-elite women dwelling in Greco-Roman Egypt. They thus reveal to us the sort of information about women in Egypt which we would give anything to have about any women elsewhere in the ancient Greco-Roman world. The difficulty remains, however, that what one can feasibly study about women elsewhere in the ancient Greco-Roman world is merely men's representations of them, and for the most part elite literary representations. Also problematic is the fact that basic commentaries on most ancient literary works usually predate 1970 and shortchange the women featured therein. These volumes therefore often need to be supplemented by newer books and articles treating the women these works depict, and women in the relevant period or social class or genre generally. One can be heartened, however, by the fact that this new scholarship is of high quality, and keeps on being produced in sizeable quantity. Despite the heavily literary nature of our source material on Greek and Roman women, this new scholarship is profitably employing cross-cultural materials and theoretical approaches derived from other disciplines (e.g. anthropology, modern literature) to integrate literary perspectives into larger societal and cognitive frameworks.

The survival wish of the classics profession in this country, the traditionally interdisciplinary outlook of the Old World classical philology

classicists treasure as their heritage, the eagerness of most classicists for anything new and relevant (especially that which links classics more closely to other academic departments and disciplines) have meant that the study of women in antiquity has met with minimal resistance on this continent. Indeed, certain new methodologies deployed in research unrelated to, as well as in research on, women seem to arouse more opposition.[42] In addition, what I (to coin some phrases) would call the xenerastia and Anglomania of certain leaders in the U.S. classics establishment have lent prestige to the study of women in antiquity. This is largely due to the fact that European and British scholars, from Nietzsche's Basel colleague Bachofen in the 1860's to the classically trained British sociologist Keith Hopkins in the 1960's, have written some of the seminal works in the field. This is also because European and British scholars have contributed to the two issues of Arethusa which along with Pomeroy's book have legitimated once and for all the new research on women in classical artiquity, research which seeks both to interpret and place in a larger context all the information about Greco-Roman women gatherable. Only lately, however, and with great apologies for tardiness, have British classical organizations and journals started to sponsor and publish research efforts of this sort on women; Europeans' organized endeavors at sponsorship are even slower to get started.[43] We classical philologists can rightly take pride in what our field has done, and harbor high hopes for what it can do, to advance the study of women. Regrettably, however, classics lacks the potential which most other humanities disciplines have for complete self-redefinition through integrating the study of women: the data from, as well as about, women from the classical period which are needed to bring about such a transformation are not to be found and probably never will be found.

Footnotes

[1]For Alcibiades' campaign, see Plato, Symposium 213d (especially 216c ff.) and the discussion of K.J. Dover, Greek Homosexuality (London and Cambridge, Mass. 1978) 157-158. The findings of Dover on the upright position of the beloved in male homosexual congress among the Athenian elite might prompt one to substitute "bed up" for "bed down."

[2]The representation of women in the classics profession in North America is not, of course, the focus of this paper. For statistics, see now the report of the American Philological Association Committee on the Status of Women and Minorities, summarized in the American Philological Association newsletter, Vol 6, no. 2 (Spring 1983) 7-9. It notes, inter alia, that women's representation in the profession as a whole (at least 26%) is still higher than women's submission rate to and acceptance rate by U.S. and Canadian journals (21% and 23%), and than the percentage of women on editorial boards of these publications (21%). Women's profession-wide representation is now, however, lower than their percentage of earned Ph.D's in 1980-81 (46%), academic appointments assumed in the same year (34%) and presentations at the annual meeting (31% papers and 33% chairing panels and seminars, with an acceptance rate for the former of 43.7% versus one of 40.6% for men).

[3]See, e.g. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, New College Edition (Boston 1969) 984.

[4]See H. Lloyd-Jones in the introduction of U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, History of Classical Scholarship (Geschichte der Philologie, 1921), translated from the German by A. Harris (Baltimore 1982) vii ff.; J. Peradotto, "Texts and Unrefracted Facts: Philology, Hermeneutics and Semiotics," Arethusa 16 (1983) 15 ff. I owe the "old-fashioned" definition of philology--from the pre-1926 Encyclopedia Britannica entry on philology--to Peradotto.

[5]This analogy between the founding fathers of our profession and Biblical patriarchs is not entirely fanciful; in the pre-Wilamowitzian generation, Karl Lehrs (1802-1878), Professor at Königsburg, issued "Ten Commandments for Classical Philologists." For a translation and explication, see W.M. Calder III, "Karl Lehrs' Ten Commandments for Classical Philologists," Classical World 74.4 (1980-1981) 227-228.

[6]Lloyd-Jones, vii. L'Annee Philologique, which was established after France's defeat of Germany in the first World War in Paris, but now has offices in Chapel Hill and Heidelberg as well, includes bibliographic surveys of ancient art historical and archaeological publications. Recognition of "classical studies" as comprising a "cluster of disciplines"--"philology, history, philosophy, archaeology, and others," and as "international" in "organization" is voiced among the "basic principles" of Research Tools for Classics. The Report of the American Philological Association's Ad Hoc Committee on Basic Research Tools, ed. R.S. Bagnall (Chico, California 1980) 3.

[7]Lloyd-Jones, vii-viii.

[8]E.g. J-C Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon. For the view of classics as science, see Lloyd-Jones, viii and xviii ff. and G. Highet, The Classical Tradition. Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature (London, Oxford and New York 1949) 495 ff.

[9]For details of these appropriations and expropriations, the classic study is Highet, especially his sections on the Renaissance (104-218) and "Transition" (from the Renaissance to our own day: 255-465). See also R. Jenkyns, The Victorians and Ancient Greece (Cambridge, Mass. 1980) 1-20.

[10]See Jenkyns, 60-67 and 274-279.

[11]So Lloyd-Jones, xii-xiii, Peradotto, 18, reminds us that twenty years ago a U.S. university press "rejected a translation of this work on the grounds that it would antagonize the / classics / profession." Lest we be tempted to lionize Nietzsche for his "modern" position on this issue, though, Calder's review of Lloyd-Jones in the American Journal of Philology 84 (1983) 110 reminds us that Nietzsche's antagonism to the classics establishment of his day was rooted in his anti-Semitism: e.g., he bore no personal antipathy towards his former schoolmate Wilamowitz because he blamed Wilamowitz' "corruption" on "Berlin Jews."

[12]See Calder, "Werner Jaeger and Richard Harder: an Erklarung." Quaderni di Storia 17 (1983) 108. As Lloyd-Jones observes on xi, however, the impulse to portray in realistic detail "the factual and material background of ancient life" had originally come to the historians from the romantics.

[13]So Jenkyns, 64.

[14]The Realms of Gold (London 1975) 25.

[15]See, e.g., The American Heritage Dictionary, 248. I owe this important point to Peggy McIntosh.

[16]Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience (Cambridge, Mass. 1970) and Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks (Cambridge, Mass. 1983).

[17]For social class and class economic exploitation in (and Marx on) classical antiquity, see, for example, Arethusa 8.1 (Spring 1975), "Marxism and the Classics," ed. J.P. Sullivan, especially its article "Karl Marx and the History of Classical Antiquity" by G.E.M. de Ste. Croix; de Ste. Croix' recent The Class Struggle in the Ancient World (Ithaca, N.Y. 1981); P.W. Rose, "Class Ambivalence in the Odyssey," Historia 24 (1975) 128-149 and "Towards a Dialectical Hermeneutic of Pindar's Pythian X," Helios n.s. 9 (1982) 47-73.

For Greek and Roman working classes and slaves, see, for example, P. Herfst, Le travail de la femme dans la Grèce ancienne (Utrecht 1922);

S. Treggiari, Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic (Oxford 1969), "Domestic Staff at Rome in the Julio-Claudian Period, 27 B.C. to A.D. 68," Histoire sociale; revue canadienne 6 (1973) 241-255, "Lower Class Women in the Roman Economy," Florilegium 1 (1979) 65-86, which supplements J. Le Gall, Metiers des femmes au Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum," Revue des études latines 47 (1969) 123-130 and "Jobs for Women," American Journal of Ancient History 1 (1976) 76-104.

[18]This has not always been the case, though. See notes 11 above and 22 below on German classicists' racism as well as Jenkyns, 166-168, on the Victorian British variety. As Highet's discussion of Nietzsche, 460, also observes, a tenet of this racism was that the ancient Jews were a people "born for slavery." Whether or not the association of ancient slaves and freedmen with Jews and "non-classical" peoples is responsible, a vision of classical antiquity which "tuned out" the Greco-Roman lower classes once prevailed.

[19]On this topic see also Calder's "Research Opportunities in the Modern History of Classical Scholarship," CW 74.5 (1981) 241-251 and the responses to the article in CW 75.2 (1981) 120-122, 75.4 (1982) 248-250 and 75.6 (1982) 362-366.

[20]E.g. H.D.F. Kitto, in his treatment of ancient Greek women in The Greeks (Harmondsworth 1957) 219-236, discussed again below.

[21]As Highet's chapter on "The Battle of the Books", 261-288 emphasizes, slavish emulation of Greco-Roman literature (on the grounds that classical works could not be surpassed) came to an end in the early eighteenth century; oddly enough, a female scholar, Madame Dacier (1654-1720), argued valiantly in favor of ancient (and against modern) accomplishments. That lavish, if not slavish, imitation of ancient practices (e.g. the cult of athletics, Spartan-style education for boys) as well as of ancient art continued among the Victorian elite in Britain is documented and delightfully discussed by Jenkyns, 215 ff. and 298 ff.

[22]Classicists in this country are only now struggling to come to terms with the career and networking patterns of Werner Jaeger's student Richard Harder, who headed the racist Institut für indogermanisches Geistesgeschichte under the Nazis; on this topic, see most recently the article by Calder cited in n. 12 above.

[23]For the phrase "the age when the memory is best," see Lloyd-Jones, xxx; for the same sentiment, see Highet, 493 (who maintains that getting the essential memory work over quickly lets "the boy understand and appreciate Greek and Latin literature when he reaches the appreciative age"); for more on Mill, see Jenkyns, 60 ff. and 230 ff.

[24]For the "favoring" of male Latin students by the traditional system see again Jenkyns, 64, and Highet's remark on the best age for "the boy" to learn Latin in the preceding note. For the privileged position of classical languages in higher educational institutions of many Western countries from

ca. 1600 to 1900, see Highet, 257. Highet's critique on 490 ff. of various "traditional" classics teaching methods--which in his opinion have precipitated the decline of classical studies--spells out the details of the problem and its consequences; Highet's words should be required reading for all classicists.

[25]A recent article by Nancy O. Mavrogenes, "The Teaching of Greek and Latin According to Francis Parker and John Dewey," The Classical Outlook 60.1 (1982) 3ff. discusses the innovative classics teaching ideas of these two turn-of-the-century educational reformers. Although both men instituted these reforms in progressive coeducational schools (and Parker's curriculum included study of Roman women per se), and although both eschewed teaching by means of recitation, rote memorization and other techniques in which children functioned as passive receptacles of information, both still accorded Caesar's Gallic Wars pride of place in the Latin curriculum. Parker also gave readings about the Persian Wars and from Xenophon a central position in the study of Greek. Other "schoolboy" authors--Cicero, Vergil, Livy--and the study of ancient warfare received extensive attention as well.

[26]See Peradotto, 16 and 30 n.1; Wilamowitz' remarks are quoted by Peradotto from Calder, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 16 (1975) 452.

[27]For nineteenth and twentieth century textual criticism, and the philosophy of its greatest practitioner, A.E. Housman, see Lloyd-Jones, xxi-xxiii and 130 ff. as well as Highet, 496 ff.

[28]For "data acquisition" as the object of graduate research in classics and the "original contribution" expected of Ph.D. dissertations in Germany (and hence the Teutonophilic U.S. system), see Highet, 499-500.

[29]For such researches, see L. Goodwater, Women in Antiquity: An Annotated Bibliography (Metuchen, N.J. 1975).

[30]In discussing the debt of Pound to Sappho, Highet, 517, refers to classical material as "infinitely adaptable." Jenkyns, 194 ff., notes how the British Victorian elite turned to Homer and against Vergil. Yet even though both Highet and Jenkyns furnish such and other abundant evidence for the flexible and expansive nature of the classical authors' canon, neither they nor any other studies of the classical tradition with which I am familiar recognize this phenomenon as such, and as important; I am indebted to Lillian Robinson, Deborah Lambert, and the Mellon Seminar for this notion.

[31]See Highet, 496, and H. Harrauer, Bibliography to the Augustan Poetry II: A Bibliography to Propertius (Hildesheim 1973) 15, on Housman's Propertius articles of 1891, 1894, and 1895; their publication was followed by a spate of English editions, translations, commentaries, and studies as well as by Pound's "Homage to Sextus Propertius."

[32]The plays of Plautus and Terence have enjoyed much attention of late because extensive papyrus fragments of Menander's Greek comedies, models for both of these Roman dramatists, have come to light. See, e.g., the surveys

of new scholarship on Roman comedy by Erich Segal and Sander Goldberg in CW 74.7 (1981) and 75.2 (1981) 71-115.

[33]See Highet, 57-62, 132-133, 203-209, 380-381, and 689.

[34]The proliferation of Sappho studies since the advent of the new women's (and lesbian gay rights) movement--and the publication of these studies in the most prestigious places--makes this point all too clear. The Harvard University Press, for example, has just issued a new translation of Sappho's fragments in its Loeb Classical Library series (by David Campbell, a Scot teaching in British Columbia). Another new Harvard University Press book, Three Classical Poets (1982), devotes 84 of its 221 pages and two of its three appendices to Sappho; its author, R. Jenkyns of Oxford and The Victorians and Ancient Greece, barely mentioned her (though he had every reason to have done so) in his earlier book.

[35]Another change, the anonymous refereeing of abstracts for the APA meeting, and of manuscripts submitted to most U.S. and Canadian journals, was instituted at the urging of the Women's Classical Caucus and APA Committee on the Status of Women and Minorities during the past decade; this change cannot be unrelated to the greater number and percentage of papers by women now being presented and of articles by women being published.

[36]The special journal issues are: Arethusa 6.1 (Spring 1973) and 11 (1978); Women's Studies 8 (1981). Most of the Arethusa essays will be published in an updated Women in the Ancient World. The Arethusa Papers, ed. J.P. Sullivan and J. Peradotto (Buffalo 1983); the Women's Studies essays, augmented by several others, have been published in Reflections of Women in Antiquity, ed. H.P. Foley (New York, London and Paris 1982).

[37]Nietzsche's misogynistic remarks include, "Man shall be trained for war and woman for the recreation of the warrior. All else is folly...Thou goest to woman? Do not forget thy whip" (from Thus Spake Zarathustra) and "Woman has so much cause for shame; in woman there is so much pedantry, superficiality, schoolmasterliness, petty presumption, unbridledness, and indiscretion concealed...which has really been restrained and dominated hitherto by the fear of man" (from Beyond Good and Evil).

[38]For Homer's description of a female ruler at Iliad 6.425, see also Pomeroy, 22-23. For Lattimore's mistranslation in his Iliad (Chicago 1951), see 166. His misrendering of Odyssey 6.184 occurs at 107 of his Odyssey (Chicago 1965).

[39]Herodotus 7.99, misrendered by A. de Selincourt, Herodotus, The Histories (Harmondsworth 1954) 446.

[40]Latin. An Introductory Course Based on Ancient Authors, third ed. (New York 1963).

[41]Third edition, 1962.

[42]See most recently Peradotto's remarks on the successful resistance of

classics to "the inroads of current methodological concern," at 15 ff., especially his reflections on the "greatest source of suspicion or reserve among classicists when it comes to structuralism, semiotics and the intellectual movements generated by them" at 19 ff.

[43]Curiously, though, the eastward spread of such research and organizational efforts is evidently outpacing that of courses in translation; for evidence of this eastward movement, see, e.g. Images of Women in Antiquity, ed. A.M. Cameron and A. Kurth (London 1983) and the forthcoming Italian co-sponsored (first international) congress on women in classical antiquity.